

Scott Whitworth, NV Bar #15671  
 Jason Sifers, NV Bar # 14273  
**MGM RESORTS INTERNATIONAL**  
 6385 S. Rainbow Blvd., Suite 500  
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89118  
 Tel: (702) 692-5651  
 Fax: (702)669-4501  
 Email: [switworth@mgmresorts.com](mailto:switworth@mgmresorts.com)  
 Email: [jsifers@mgmresorts.com](mailto:jsifers@mgmresorts.com)

*Attorney for Defendant*  
*MGM Grand Hotel, LLC*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

SALVADOR A. LIBUTAN, an Individual  
  
 Plaintiff,  
  
 vs.  
  
 MGM GRAND HOTEL LLC, a Domestic  
 Limited-Liability Company.  
  
 Defendants.

Case No.: 2:20-cv-00304-RFB-NJK

**STIPULATION AND ORDER TO EXTEND  
 DISCOVERY BY A PERIOD OF NINETY  
 (90) DAYS**  
**(FIRST REQUEST)**

Plaintiff Salvador A. Libutan (“Plaintiff”) and Defendant MGM Grand Hotel, LLC (“Defendant” or “MGM Grand”), by and through their counsel of record, hereby stipulate and agree to extend all remaining discovery deadlines in this matter by a period of ninety (90) days. In compliance with LR 26-3 and LR IA 6-1, the parties make the request herein based upon the following:

**DISCOVERY THAT HAS BEEN COMPLETED**

Both parties have exchanged initial disclosures under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a). Plaintiff’s initial disclosures were served on November 20, 2021 and Defendant’s initial disclosures were served on October 19, 2020.

Plaintiff has served his First Request for the Production of Documents; his First Set of Interrogatories; and his First Request for Admissions. All such written discovery requests were served on December 21, 2020. Defendant served its Response to Plaintiff’s First Request for the Production of Documents on February 5, 2021; its Response to Plaintiff’s First Set of Interrogatories on February

1 4, 2021; and its Response to Plaintiff's First Request for Admissions on January 20, 2021. Defendant  
2 served initial written discovery requests on Plaintiff on March 31, 2021.

3 The parties are currently in the process of meeting and conferring regarding certain of  
4 Defendant's responses to Plaintiff's written discovery requests and hope to resolve their concerns  
5 without intervention by the Court.

6 **REASONS WHY DISCOVERY HAS NOT BEEN COMPLETED**

7 The parties have been attempting to resolve a discovery dispute arising from Defendant's  
8 responses to certain of Plaintiff's requests for production and interrogatories. Among other issues, the  
9 parties had a dispute regarding the temporal limit of Plaintiff's discovery requests. At a hearing on  
10 Defendant's partial motion to dismiss on March 30, 2021, Judge Boulware provided guidance to the  
11 parties regarding the permissible temporal scope of discovery. Defendant has agreed to supplement  
12 certain responses, but the parties are still actively engaged in a meet and confer regarding others. While  
13 the parties are attempting to resolve these issues informally and in good faith, the parties may  
14 ultimately require the Court's intervention. Once this matter has been resolved, whether by the parties  
15 or the Court, Plaintiff will be in a position to conduct its deposition of Defendant's Fed. R. Civ. P.  
16 30(b)(6) designee. The parties are therefore requesting additional time to resolve these discovery issues  
17 and then proceed swiftly with the necessary depositions.

18 **DISCOVERY THAT REMAINS TO COMPLETED**

19 As discussed above, with the parties are currently engaged in a meet and confer in an attempt  
20 to resolve a dispute regarding Defendant's discovery responses. Plaintiff anticipates that if the issues  
21 are resolved satisfactorily, additional document production and more definite interrogatory responses  
22 will need to be served. If such issues are not resolved, Plaintiff anticipates that motion practice will  
23 be necessary. Additionally, Plaintiff will need to take the deposition of the Defendant under FRCP  
24 30(b)(6) as well as potentially three other percipient witness depositions. Defendant intends to take  
25 Plaintiff's deposition and serve additional written discovery as necessary.

**PROPOSED SCHEDULE**

The parties propose the following schedule:

EVENT	CURRENT DEADLINE	PROPOSED DEADLINE
Discovery Cut-Off Date	April 26, 2021	<b>July 26, 2021</b>
Amending Pleadings/Add Parties	CLOSED	CLOSED
Expert Disclosures	CLOSED	CLOSED
Rebuttal Expert Disclosures	March 26, 2021	CLOSED
Dispositive Motions	May 26, 2021	<b>August 24, 2021</b>
Joint Pretrial Order	June 25, 2021	<b>September 23, 2021</b> or 30 days after decision on dispositive motions have been entered, whichever is later.

This is the parties' first request for an extension of the discovery schedule. As discussed above, the parties hope to resolve the outstanding issues with respect to the discovery responses that have been served without the Court's assistance and believe such additional time for the remaining discovery deadlines will prove beneficial. Accordingly, this request is made in good faith and not for the purpose of delay.

Dated: March 31, 2021.

**HKM EMPLOYMENT ATTORNEYS LLP      MGM GRAND HOTEL, LLC**

By: /s/ Dana Sniegocki

By: /s/ Jason Sifers

Jenny L. Foley, NV Bar #9017  
Dana Sniegocki, NV Bar # 11715  
1785 East Sahara, Suite 300  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89104  
Telephone: (702) 625-3893

Scott Whitworth, NV Bar #15671  
Jason Sifers, NV Bar # 14273  
6385 S. Rainbow Blvd., Suite 500  
Las Vegas, NV 89118  
Telephone: (702) 692-5651

*Attorneys For Plaintiff  
Salvador Libutan*

*Attorneys for Defendant  
MGM Grand Hotel, LLC*

**ORDER**

IT IS SO ORDERED:



UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

DATED: April 1, 2021